



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Intended Consequences Statement in Conservation Science and Practice

Citation for published version:

Phelan, R, Baumgartner, B, Brand, S, Brister, E, Burgiel, SW, Alta Charo, R, Coche, I, Cofrancesco, A, Delborne, J, Edwards, O, Fisher, JP, Gaywood, M, Gordon, DR, Howald, G, Hunter, ME, Kareiva, P, Mankad, A, Marvier, M, Moseby, K, Newhouse, A, Novak, BJ, Ohrstrom, G, Olson, S, Palmer, M, Palumbi, S, Patterson Jr., N, Pedrono, M, Pelegri, F, Rohwer, Y, Ryder, O, Royden Saah, J, Scheller, RM, Seddon, PJ, Shaffer, HB, Shapiro, B, Sweeney, M, Tercek, MR, Thizy, D, Tilt, W, Weber, M, Wegrzyn, R, Whitelaw, B, Winkler, M, Wodak, J, Zimring, M & Robbins, P 2021, 'Intended Consequences Statement in Conservation Science and Practice', *Conservation Science and Practice*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/csp2.371>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1111/csp2.371](https://doi.org/10.1111/csp2.371)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Published In:

Conservation Science and Practice

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. © 2021 The Authors. Conservation Science and Practice published by Wiley Periodicals LLC. on behalf of Society for Conservation Biology

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Intended consequences statement

Ryan Phelan¹ | Bridget Baumgartner¹ | Stewart Brand¹ | Evelyn Brister²  | Stanley W. Burgiel³  | R. Alta Charo⁴ | Isabelle Coche⁵ | Al Cofrancesco⁶ | Jason A. Delborne⁷ | Owain Edwards⁸ | Joshua P. Fisher⁹ | Martin Gaywood¹⁰ | Doria R. Gordon¹¹ | Gregg Howald¹² | Margaret E. Hunter¹³ | Peter Kareiva¹⁴ | Aditi Mankad⁸ | Michelle Marvier¹⁵ | Katherine Moseby¹⁶ | Andrew E. Newhouse¹⁷  | Ben J. Novak¹  | Gerry Ohrstrom¹⁸ | Steven Olson¹⁹ | Megan J. Palmer²⁰ | Stephen Palumbi²¹ | Neil Patterson Jr.²² | Miguel Pedrono²³ | Francisco Pelegri²⁴ | Yasha Rohwer²⁵  | Oliver A. Ryder²⁶ | J. Royden Saah²⁷ | Robert M. Scheller²⁸ | Philip J. Seddon²⁹ | H. Bradley Shaffer³⁰ | Beth Shapiro³¹ | Mike Sweeney³² | Mark R. Tercek³³ | Delphine Thizy³⁴ | Whitney Tilt³⁵ | Michele Weber¹  | Renee D. Wegrzyn³⁶ | Bruce Whitelaw³⁷ | Matthew Winkler³⁸ | Josh Wodak³⁹ | Mark Zimring³² | Paul Robbins⁴⁰

¹Revive & Restore, Sausalito, California²Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, New York³National Invasive Species Council, Washington, District of Columbia⁴University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, Wisconsin⁵Emerging Ag, Brussels, Belgium⁶U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Engineer Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, Mississippi⁷Genetic Engineering and Society Center, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina⁸Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, Floreat, Western Australia, Australia⁹U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Honolulu, Hawaii¹⁰NatureScot, Inverness, UK¹¹Environmental Defense Fund, Washington, District of Columbia¹²Advanced Conservation Strategies, Williamsburg, Virginia¹³U.S. Geological Survey, Wetland and Aquatic Research Center, Gainesville, Florida¹⁴University of California, Los Angeles, California¹⁵Department of Environmental Studies and Sciences, Santa Clara University, Santa Clara, California¹⁶University of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia¹⁷State University of New York, College of Environmental Science and Forestry, Syracuse, New York¹⁸Epicurus Fund, New York, New York¹⁹Association of Zoos and Aquariums, Silver Spring, Maryland²⁰Stanford University, Stanford, California²¹Hopkins Marine Station, Stanford University, Pacific Grove, California²²State University of New York, College of Environmental Science and Forestry Center for Native Peoples & the Environment, Syracuse, New York

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2021 The Authors. Conservation Science and Practice published by Wiley Periodicals LLC. on behalf of Society for Conservation Biology

²³French Agricultural Research Centre for International Development (CIRAD, UMR ASTRE), Montpellier, France

²⁴Laboratory of Genetics, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, Wisconsin

²⁵Oregon Institute of Technology, Klamath Falls, Oregon

²⁶San Diego Zoo Global, Escondido, California

²⁷Island Conservation, Santa Cruz, California

²⁸Department of Forestry and Environmental Resources, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina

²⁹University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand

³⁰Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology and La Kretz Center for California Conservation Science, Institute of the Environment and Sustainability, University of California, Los Angeles, California

³¹Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, and the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, University of California, Santa Cruz, California

³²The Nature Conservancy, San Francisco, California

³³Environmentalist, Washington, District of Columbia

³⁴Imperial College London, London, UK

³⁵Conservation Benchmarks, Bozeman, Montana

³⁶Ginkgo Bioworks, Boston, Massachusetts

³⁷The Roslin Institute, University of Edinburgh, Midlothian, UK

³⁸Asuragen, Austin, Texas

³⁹Institute for Culture and Society, Western Sydney University, Parramatta, New South Wales, Australia

⁴⁰Nelson Institute for Environmental Studies, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, Wisconsin

Correspondence

Michele Weber, Revive & Restore, Sausalito, CA, USA.

Email: michele@reviverestore.org

Funding information

Amy and Mark Tercek; Gerry Ohrstrom; The Nature Conservancy of California; University of Wisconsin-Madison; Revive & Restore

1 | INTENDED CONSEQUENCES STATEMENT

As the biodiversity crisis accelerates, the stakes are higher for threatened plants and animals. Rebuilding the health of our planet will require addressing underlying threats at many scales, including habitat loss and climate change. Conservation interventions such as habitat protection, management, restoration, predator control, translocation, genetic rescue, and biological control have the potential to help threatened or endangered species avert extinction. These existing, well-tested methods can be complemented and augmented by more frequent and faster adoption of new technologies, such as powerful new genetic tools. In addition, synthetic biology might offer solutions to currently intractable conservation problems. We believe that conservation needs to be bold and clear-eyed in this moment of great urgency.

Proposed efforts to mitigate conservation threats often raise concerns about potentially harmful unintended consequences. For some highly documented strategies based on conservation principles, such as biological control, conservation translocations, and restoration of natural fire regimes, evidence to date suggests that careful

planning produces the intended consequences while avoiding adverse unintended consequences. For example, better identification and mitigation of risks has resulted in no severe, negative, unintended consequences for conservation translocations and biological control releases over the last 30 years in the United States (Novak et al., this issue).

This progress, especially after the well-publicized harmful interventions from the early history of the field, has been made by improving conservation intervention techniques, scientific understanding of dynamic interactions in complex ecosystems, and early stakeholder engagement. The substantial history of intervention should encourage us to thoughtfully pursue novel approaches to conservation as the technology advances, focusing on the future we want, rather than being daunted by the future we fear.

In June 2020, Revive & Restore convened a group of 57 conservationists, wildlife biologists, restoration specialists, conservation geneticists, ethicists, and social scientists to propose a new framework for the future of conservation, focused on intended consequences. There was broad consensus that developing and employing what might be considered controversial genetic

technologies will require a commitment to responsible decision-making that respects the diversity of perspectives, interests, and values among different stakeholders. To encourage working confidently with emerging tools and technologies, we propose a framework that increases inclusivity and embraces conservation innovation.

The participants of the Intended Consequences Workshop agree that:

- Conservationists and other stakeholders should codesign conservation interventions to advance biodiversity goals and achieve intended consequences.
- A broader definition of risk and the development of new risk assessment tools will facilitate appropriate risk identification and mitigation during intervention planning and implementation.
- Inaction and delay also incur consequences. The risks of inaction must also be identified and taken into consideration.
- Being transparent about social and cultural values is essential to success because science alone cannot tell us what we should do.
- Inclusive engagement with communities and stakeholders, including indigenous peoples and marginalized groups, allows for a thoughtful exploration of diverse visions for future ecosystems and the path to a vibrant and resilient nature.
- A code of practice for genetic interventions that weighs ecological and social risks, and potential benefits, will help conservationists, funders and the public make informed decisions for responsible and innovative action.
- The code of practice should evolve with new knowledge, additional experience, and further deliberation via an inclusive process.
- Monitoring results, both positive and negative, will help conservationists design successful interventions, manage uncertainty, and codify lessons learned along the way.

These initial points of agreement, along with an evolving code of practice, can help guide future conservation interventions and inspire confidence in our ability to design for and achieve intended consequences.

The findings and conclusions in this article are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the views of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, CSIRO, NatureScot,

Imperial College London, San Diego Zoo Global, and National Invasive Species Council.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The workshop that inspired this statement was supported by Revive & Restore, University of Wisconsin-Madison, The Nature Conservancy of California, Gerry Ohrstrom, and Amy and Mark Tercek. We would like to thank the editor and an anonymous reviewer who read early versions and gave constructive feedback that improved this statement.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

All authors have contributed and have given final approval of the version to be published.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT


No data were collected for this article.

ETHICS STATEMENT

No data were collected for this article.

ORCID

Evelyn Brister  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5077-7692>

Stanley W. Burgiel  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6027-0577>

Andrew E. Newhouse  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9981-8309>

Ben J. Novak  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0699-634X>

Yasha Rohwer  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6765-770X>

Michele Weber  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1583-7367>

REFERENCE

- Novak, B. J., Phelan, R., & Weber, M. (this issue). U.S. conservation translocations: Over a century of intended consequences. *Conservation Science and Practice*.

How to cite this article: Phelan R, Baumgartner B, Brand S, et al. Intended consequences statement. *Conservation Science and Practice*. 2021;e371. <https://doi.org/10.1111/csp2.371>